

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are pending. Claims 9, 18, 19 and 21-23 are amended herein.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Specification of the Bluetooth System, Wireless Connections Made Easy, Profiles" ("the Specification") in view of Slaughter, III et al. ("Slaughter;" U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) and further in view of Sondermann et al. ("Sondermann;" U.S. Patent No. 5,448,764). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 is not shown or suggested by the Specification, Slaughter and Sondermann, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the statement in the instant Office Action that the combination of the Specification and Slaughter does not disclose determining whether a name for a responding device is present in memory cache, transmitting a wireless request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache, receiving a name for the responding device in response to the wireless request, and storing the name received from the responding device in the memory cache, where the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Sondermann overcomes the shortcomings of the Specification and Slaughter, as discussed below.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Sondermann (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) does not show or suggest "determining whether a name for said responding device is present in said memory cache" as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 18. Sondermann (alone or in combination with the Specification and Slaughter) also does not show "transmitting a wireless request for a name to said responding device provided a name for said responding device is absent from said memory cache" as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 18. Note that this latter step is conditional on the outcome of the aforementioned "determining" step.

According to Sondermann, there are two identification codes stored by a base station. If the base station receives a proper second identification code from a handset, then the base station sends a first identification code to the handset, and the first identification code is used thenceforth between the base station and the handset (apparently, the base station only communicates with handsets that have the first identification code, and the second identification code is used by a handset to gain access to the first identification code).

Consider first the perspective from the handset. According to Sondermann, the handset communicates an identification code to the base station simply because a user enters the identification code and instructs the handset to do so. Importantly, the handset of Sondermann does not make a determination as to whether the identification code is already stored

in its memory. Importantly, the handset of Sondermann does not send the identification code in response to a request from the base station.

Consider next the perspective from the base station. Importantly, the base station of Sondermann does not send a request for an identification code to the handset. In particular, the base station of Sondermann does not send a request for an identification code to the handset after determining that the identification code does not exist in its memory (note that the first and second identification codes already exist in the memory of the base station). As described above, the handset of Sondermann is the initiator of the exchange of identification codes.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification, Slaughter and Sondermann, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention as recited by independent Claims 1, 9 and 18, and that Claims 1, 9 and 18 are therefore in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification, Slaughter and Sondermann, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 dependent on Claims 1, 9 and 18, and that Claims 3-8, 11-17 and 19-26 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions


In light of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 5/17/04